

~~SECRET~~

COPY 1 of 3 COPIES

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

63rd Meeting

14 November 1960

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

. . . . The 63rd meeting of the CIA Career Council convened on Monday, 14 November 1960, at 3:30 p.m., in Room 136 Admin Building, with the following present:

Emmett D. Echols, Chairman
 Robert Amory, Jr., Member
 Matthew Baird, Member
 [] Alternate Member
 Richard Helms, Alternate Member
 [] Member
 Lawrence K. White, Member
 [] Recording Secretary

25X1A9A

MR. ECHOLS: The first item is the Minutes of the last meeting. Any comments, suggestions, corrections?

MR. BAIRD: I make a motion they be approved.

MR. HELMS: Second.

MR. ECHOLS: Item 2 is the Awards. I knew nothing about these awards from past experience but going back in the files I find the procedure is that the Council pass on these things and recommend them to the Director. But I have a hunch they are becoming so numerous you may want to consider later on passing this job or the screening of this work on to the Development Board when it is established. I don't know how you feel about that.

COLONEL WHITE: I think I would agree with that, Emmett. I think the fact has been that we haven't really in the past participated in very many of these, and the senior ones - like the one Kirk got last year-- that was the National Civil Service League Award, wasn't it?--and the President's Award for outstanding service have been the type that have been tabled here for consideration at the Deputies' Meeting and a decision made there as to what we would do. But I would agree that when the Development Board is established they can certainly screen most of these, if not all of them.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. ECHOLS: Well, the first of these awards we ought to consider at the present time is the National Civil Service League Career Service Awards. We have three candidates, all from the DD/I. The nominations from the Director are to go to the Civil Service League by 5 December 1960. I think in view of the fact that all of the candidates are from the DD/I that Bob (Amory) should comment on each of them.

. . . . Off the record discussion

MR. ECHOLS: The next item is the Arthur S. Flemming Award. We have two candidates, both from the DD/I again.

. . . . Off the record discussion

COLONEL WHITE: It's for security reasons that the DD/P doesn't have any candidates.

MR. HELMS: It's just plain too complicated, that's all. Even if we took a fellow that was known as CIA, by the time you get down to justifying why this guy is as good as some fellow in the State Department or Commerce or someplace else, you have to build up quite a case to support it, and we just don't have the fibers to put together to make this case without getting into all kinds of things we can't get into or shouldn't get into.

MR. BAIRD: I would think our internal merit medals and awards of that nature are for those people.

MR. ECHOLS: The next one is the Federal Woman's Award. There are two candidates:

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: They both deserve it. Why don't you put both of them in.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

COLONEL WHITE: I'd put them both in.

MR. HELMS: That will please the Boss enormously.

MR. ECHOLS: And we have no nominations for the William A. Jump Memorial Award.

I can report on two other awards here. We nominated Dr. Guthe for the Rockefeller Award on September 14th, and the winners will be announced in early 1961. And last year we nominated Mr. (Office of Logistics) for the National Capital Award, and he was selected as the architect to receive this Award. The Award was presented at a luncheon on 25 February 1960.

The next item on the agenda is our one-step promotion policy. We sent out some worksheets containing argumentation pro and con, which I am prepared to clarify or elaborate on, as you wish.

MR. BAIRD: I can make a recommendation now, if you're ready for it. My understanding is that the recommendation of the Office of Personnel is that Alternate Course of Action No. 4 be adopted, and I make a motion that we adopt this recommendation.

MR. HELMS: Well, in commenting on that I would like to continue in the Clandestine Services having single grade promotions in 9, 10, and 11; in other words, if the Council decides to go Route 4, we would like to have an exception for the Clandestine Services and continue the procedure of 9, 10, and 11 there.

I would go along with that--make it permissive - is that what you mean?

MR. HELMS: Yes, and we will establish it as our policy, as long as this board makes it permissive.

MR. AMORY: We thought everybody would agree to continue with

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the present policy but modify it to six months rather than one year, as is apparently now the case.

MR. HELMS: It was my understanding this new proposal would be to jump from 9 to 11 in every case.

MR. AMORY: I would go along with you and say single grade promotions, but I would say if you wanted to advance somebody fast you could put him up for a 10 in September and an 11 in January. Most people would go through this 10 step and maybe wait a year. We particularly like having this because it enables you to make sensitive adjustments when you hire a guy a little unfairly low and you suddenly realize the guy has more background knowledge than you expected, you have a chance to make a fine adjustment.

MR. ECHOLS: I'd like to speak to that, Bob. I was at the meeting last year when this was brought up and we adopted this policy, and it is my distinct recollection that at that time we abolished the time-in-grade requirement in the Regulation. The Regulation has never been rescinded, but it was clearly understood by all Offices, I thought, that the time-in-grade provisions were abolished.

25X1A9A That is right. I talked to Gordon Stewart about it because I wanted it changed. That Regulation is only a guide. They were going to come out with a new one and then they said they didn't need to come out with a new one because this is only a guide.

MR. ECHOLS: It is not a requirement, Bob, as I see it.

MR. BAIRD: I also would feel that whatever we do ought to be Agency-wide, and I would withdraw my recommendation, because I would not like it to affect the JOT's, so many of whom go to the DD/P anyway. It ought to be Agency-wide--if it's permissive everywhere, that's all right.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

COLONEL WHITE: Well, in the DD/S Matt had a position which he just stated, and [] also thought this was good for the Office of Communications, and, with those two exceptions, it didn't seem to matter too much to the DD/S Offices. So we would have no problem if you want to continue the present policy - that is, make the experiment official now. To retain the one-grade promotion policy is no problem as far as we are concerned.

MR. BAIRD: One grade promotion with no actual time-in-grade restriction.

COLONEL WHITE: Right.

MR. AMORY: And that satisfies you [indicating Mr. Helms]?

MR. HELMS: Yes.

MR. ECHOLS: Can you [indicating Mr. Amory] live with that?

MR. AMORY: Absolutely.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay - continuation of our present policy, with no time-in-grade limitations.

MR. AMORY: Right.

25X1A9A

[] In my case 10's are useless, because every 9 is qualified and has lots of time in grade, and he's in an 11 slot, so the 10 is just a rather futile gesture. That is why I said make it permissive for a 10. I have to have 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 one grade or it would wreck my grade structure.

MR. HELMS: I think this is a good way to have it - then everybody isn't in a strait jacket. We have enough problems in the Agency, and I think the more flexibility we have--without doing violence to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

conformity and uniformity and so on--the better it will be for all of us.

MR. BAIRD: Yes. And if you have transfers between Services--

MR. HELMS: Under this system a transfer between Services won't do violence to anybody - just transfer at the grade they have had.

COLONEL WHITE: You ☐ indicating ☐ indicated 25X1
you would like to have it permissive in the Office of Communications to go from 9 to 11.

25X1A9A ☐ Yes, because I thought we were going the other way - abolish this and make double jumps as we used to. I can't work it that way - except I can go from 9 to 11.

COLONEL WHITE: To go from 9 to 10 instead of 9 to 11 - is this going to do harm to Commo?

25X1A9A ☐ I have no 10 slots.

MR. AMORY: Our idea is a 9 in a 10 slot once he has proved himself gets jacked up to 10.

25X1A9A ☐ That is what I have been doing. I haven't paid any attention to time in grade. It won't hurt me.

25X1 MR. ECHOLS: Mind you, we are not classifying, by and large-- with some exceptions, ☐--we are not classifying new positions at 6, 8, and 10, but we are following the one-step promotion policy - a 7 goes into a 9 position when he is promoted to 8--

25X1A9A ☐ Don't you classify sixes and eights?

MR. ECHOLS: Some positions, yes - like clericals.

MR. BAIRD: But you budget for the higher grade anyhow.

MR. ECHOLS: Fine.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. ECHOLS: Now I would like to take up one more item, if we have time here.

On 30 October 1960 the DCI approved the Career Council paper which, as you know, stemmed from our review of the Inspector General's Report on Career Service. In looking over that paper I find three specific recommendations which I would say call for action at this time. In reverse order, Item 4e - Individual Career Planning - calls for the rescission of Regulation On that specific point, 25X1 we have asked for the rescission of that Regulation. The second part of that recommendation calls for "individualized career planning by Heads of Career Services, operating officials, etc., of those persons who may be expected to grow and develop." I think there is complete understanding of what we mean here, and I see no need for any action on this score other than to attempt to incorporate this practice throughout our system of personnel management and development as it is established and improved upon. I don't think a Regulation or anything like that is necessary. So, if you agree, I would like to consider that item 4e has been fully acted upon, and we will continue to act upon it, as appropriate, in our development of the personnel management system. Any comments on that point?

MR. AMORY: Fine.

MR. HELMS: Sounds all right.

MR. ECHOLS: Item 4c calls for the abolishment of the Selection Board and Examining Panels for entry of persons into the Career Staff, and it also provides that in the future the selection of individuals for the Career Staff will be the responsibility of the Heads of Career Services.

In addition, there are two new conjunctive requirements

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

which would be adopted for admission into career status, and they are:
age 25 and three years of satisfactory service.

Now, on the first point, the Selection Board and Examining Panels have ceased operations, so their abolishment has taken place. And on the second part of this recommendation we have not yet come up with a precise procedure to be put into effect wherein the Career Services do in fact take people into the Career Staff. Now I have thought this over and studied it very carefully, and I think that the Agency over the years has made a serious mistake. Let me try something on you for size. It appears to me that the basic purpose of our Career Service system is to divide our total complement of personnel into compatible groups for management purposes - compatible by vocational field, compatible generally speaking by organizational structure, and compatible by grade levels and so on. When you manage so many thousands of people you have to put them into manageable groups. Now for reasons completely unknown to me this Agency historically has failed to adopt many of the key descriptive techniques that have been provided for in the Foreign Service and the Civil Service. It seems to me that the Agency should try to put tags or labels on its people which are descriptive of the mutual intentions of the parties - our intentions toward them and their intentions toward the Agency. I don't know why we have not done so. I think it would be to the benefit of the Agency, and it would greatly simplify the administration of our body of personnel if we were to adopt some descriptive tags. Some of them would be formal tags, such as the types of appointment actions that have been processed, and some of them would be informal tags, within the formal structure, which would be used by the Career Services in their identification and administration of Agency employees. Roughly, this is the way I see that it should go, if we are to profit from the experiences of the Foreign Service and the Federal competitive service. For example, in our career employee group we have now recognized that we need a tag

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

or title such as "Provisional Career Employee." Now there is a counterpart of this in the Civil Service - they call it "Career Conditional" for three years. This is very similar to our proposed "Provisional Career Employee." I think we should have such a category and I think the Personnel Action that a man receives when he comes with this Agency should put him in this category to make it easier to administer him. When we come to the point of reviewing a man's career with us at the end of three years and deciding whether or not he should be taken into the Career Staff I think some kind of formal recognition - formal action - would be necessary. By incorporating this review and determination and building it into the appointment action I think we can use the normal machinery we have today--that which applies to promotion procedures and evaluation of performance. The Personnel Action could be initiated when the Career Service decides that a man shall be taken into the Career Service and taken out of the "Provisional Career Employee" category. So I think there is a useful purpose for this type of thing.

I think we have made a mistake heretofore in failing to recognize that we have differing types of career employees. I think it was brought out beautifully in the IG Report, and in our various comments on that Report, that we have career people with definite limits on their usefulness to us and limits on their service obligations to the Agency. I think we ought to have "Career Employees - General", if you will, and "Career Employees - Special" - for lack of a better term. I would point out to you that we have hundreds of people in this Agency who are engaged in peripheral activities - narrow, specialized vocational fields such as or places like that. For these people their career field is peripheral to Agency activities - it's a very narrow, limited field. Sure, they need some career management and development perhaps, but they simply don't fit our basic concept of a "Career Employee - General", with a complete service

25X1A6A

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

obligation to the Agency. These people don't accept service obligations and we don't impose or intend to impose unlimited service obligations on them. If we include these people with our career employees then we get all snarled up when we start to manage these people and plan development and training programs for them--because they just don't fit. And I think if we were to identify them - not by a Personnel Action in this case, necessarily, but identify them as between "Career Employees - General" and "Career Employees - Special" (or "Career Employees - Limited") that it would simplify the substantive administration of these people, and do so without stigma. I bring this up specifically because the DDP among other things is concerned about people who at some point in their career assume a full service obligation to the Agency, specifically to the Clandestine Services, and then due to a change in conditions are forced to or desire to limit their service obligation. For example, supposing you had two women JOT's that came into the Agency and the first three years are in the category of "Provisional Employees" and at the end of that time you take a look at them and you decide you will accept them in the Career Staff. Now one of them may have married during this provisional period and maybe married someone who lives here locally but who is not with the Agency - or conceivably even married to an Agency employee. You might decide at this point, "This is fine - we will take this person into the Career Staff of this organization" - but you recognize immediately that she does not meet the service obligations to the Agency but in fact assumes a limited service obligation to the DDP--and so she would not be taken into the "Career Employee - General" category but into the "Career Employee - Special" category. And from there on in, with these people you would know that you have a special administrative problem, special development problem, and a special training problem on these "Career Special" people, but nevertheless they would be career employees. The State Department has something like this in their foreign posts -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

they have what they call "resident staff employees" whose service obligation is limited only to that one specific location, and who don't intend and won't go anywhere else, and so the State Department recognizes this and puts a little label on these people to make subsequent administration easier for this class of employees. We have utilized on occasion in the past a category of "temporary employees", and I think we should perhaps use it more honestly and more thoroughly in the future when we hire somebody for a term of, let's say, up to one year, or possibly less than a year.

And lastly, I would think we would benefit greatly if we were to adopt something comparable to the "Reserve" category that the State Department uses when we appoint somebody for a period of, let's say, three to five years because we're building up a paramilitary task force, or something like that. Some of these people during this three to five year period may prove to be very versatile and just the very type of person we want for normal career duties, and they could always be transferred over and given career status, but why start them out that way? We have done that to date - everybody we have taken in, even though it's for an obviously short-term activity of indefinite duration, we have always given staff status--and I don't think this is sound. I seriously think we have handicapped and have constipated our problems of administering our employees by failing to sort them out initially and keep them in the proper categories as we go along. So I have drafted a little paper on this subject, which I would like to farm out for your consideration.

MR. HELMS: All right - let's have a look at it.

MR. ECHOLS: Now, going to the last item, the Career Development Board itself. This Board can of course be activated instantly, and I have the DD/I and DD/P nominations of Career Development Officers, but Colonel White has a problem and has not yet come up with his nominee.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

However, I see a very serious problem in conjunction with the establishment of this Board. I would point out that the purposes of this Board are to devise policies, for Agency adoption, for the development of Agency personnel at various levels, and also (at the senior level, at least) to help in the process of identification of individuals to be developed, with senior executive positions in mind, at the Agency level. This is fine. I think there is complete agreement as to what is desired and what is to be done here. But I would point out to you that the recent IG Report on Training comes up with some specific recommendations for the establishment and development of a mid-career and senior officer development program and senior officer training program, and I would express my personal belief that it is impossible - or certainly ill-advised - to attempt to devise training programs in the area of mid-career development and senior officer training programs and try to do so by some separate mechanism and some special effort from that planned by this Career Development Board. It appears to me that it is at this level [CIA Career Council] where we must bring together the operational requirements and needs of the various operating offices and the personnel program of the Agency and the training program of the Agency - it's all one and the same thing. The only solution I see to this problem of trying to approach the problems of personnel development from a personnel management point of view and a personnel training point of view at the same time is to unite these activities at some level in the Agency, and the level to me seems to be right under the Career Council. And, just as a thought to kick around theoretically, I would do this by having under the Career Council a Personnel Development Board, with the Director of Personnel as its Chairman, and theoretically you could have a Training Development Board, with the exact same membership, under the chairmanship of the Director of Training. Depending on what the subject matter is, one or the other Board would deal with it. I pose this as a very significant problem

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

brought up by the IG's recent report, and it seems to be an effort that obviously must be merged. I don't know whether anyone has any views on this.

MR. BAIRD: I like it. I think it puts a heavier burden on the Career Council.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, I think it's time we are planning to move forward in the relatively unexplored areas. I think it's a burden that we probably should pick up. A lot of our development work has been brought to fruition, and our work is lighter now. Didn't we meet weekly at one time? Perhaps we are ready to move into new fields now.

COLONEL WHITE: Maybe I missed a turn in the road here somewhere, but are you suggesting that the Career Council constitute itself as one Board to 'replace both of these?

MR. ECHOLS: No. I think the Career Council should remain as is. I'm suggesting that under the Career Council there either be one combined Personnel Development and Training Board, or two separate Boards, each reporting to the Council and with, in essence, the same membership. I certainly think that Matt Baird would have to be on the Career Development Board as originally contemplated. Obviously the term "personnel development" implies both internal and external training--so it would be foolish not to have Matt on the Personnel Development Board. Conversely, I think if you try to develop a mid-career and senior officer development program and ignore the existence of the Personnel Development Board and its efforts, it would be folly.

MR. BAIRD: What is the constitution of the Career Development Board based on?

MR. ECHOLS (Reading from memo for DCI from D/Pers, Subject:

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

Career Service, dated 26 May 1960):

"Career Development Board. The Council did not agree to the establishment of this Board as proposed by the Inspector General. It does recommend the appointment by each Deputy of a Career Development Officer, the exercise by this officer of authority granted to him by the Deputy in the furthering of the career development of individuals within that component, the formation under the cognizance of the Career Council of an Agency board composed of the three Career Development Officers and chaired by the Director of Personnel which will develop Agency career development policies and arrange, with the concurrence of the Deputies concerned, for the movement of individuals from one major component to another in the interest of career development."

MR. BAIRD: Then in effect all you are doing is adding me to that Career Development Board.

MR. ECHOLS: True, but I think there is the other side of the coin--some matters are going to be principally training, and I'm only suggesting that we flip this thing back and forth, depending on the subject matter brought forth.

MR. BAIRD: But, as you said, you can't have a Training Board get together and talk about training unless in that same group is represented the operating official.

MR. ECHOLS: Right.

MR. BAIRD: This seems to me very workable - depending on the stature of the people.

MR. HELMS: Why don't you send around that proposal and let us have a look at it and study it.

COLONEL WHITE: We have until the 1st of December to get our comments in on the IG's Report on Training. I suggest that it might be proper to circulate this right away as a "think piece" - because it

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

would influence all of our comments on the IG's Report on Training. And we might just defer until after the 1st of December--which isn't far off anyway--the actual activation of the Personnel Development Board.

MR. HELMS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ECHOLS: That is fine.

Well, that is all the business I have. Any new business anybody would like to bring up? [No comment.]

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~